गुजरात में गरीब लोगों की पहचान करने के लिए मानदंड

2596. **श्री अनन्तराय देवशंकर दवे :** क्या प्रधान मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या देश में गरीब लोगों की संख्या का अनुमान लगाने के लिए गठित विशेष दल ने ऐसे लोगों की पहचान करने हेतु किसी दिशा निर्देश अथवा मानदंड का सुझाव दिया है ;

(ख) यदि हां, तो तत्संबंधी ब्यौरा क्या है ;

(ग) क्या वर्ष 1991 तक गरीबी की रेखा के नीचे रहने वाले लोगों की संख्या के संबंध में कोई मूल्यांकन किया गया है ;

(घ) यदि हां, तो तत्संबंधी जिला-वार ब्यौरा क्या है ; और

(ङ) राज्य के कच्छ, पंचमहल, सुरेन्द्र नगर और बनासकान्ठा जिलों में ऐसे व्यक्तियों का ब्यौरा क्या है ?

योजना और कार्यक्रम कार्यान्वयन मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्रीमती रत्नमाला देहरेश्वर सवनूर) : (क) योजना आयोग को गुजरात में गरीब लोगों का अनुमान लगाने के लिए किसी विशेष दल के गठन की जानकारी नहीं है ;

(ख) उपर्युक्त (क) को ध्यान में रखते हुए प्रश्न नहीं उठता ।

(ग) योजना आयोग उपभोक्ता व्यय पर पंचवार्षिक राष्ट्रीय नमूना सर्वेक्षण (एनएसएस) आंकड़ों के आधार पर गरीबी का अनुमान लगाता है । नवीनतम अनुमान 1993-94 वर्ष से संबंधित है जो एनएसएस उपभोक्ता व्यय आंकड़ों के 50वें दौर पर आधारित है । इसके अनुसार गुजरात में गरीबी रेखा से नीचे जीवनयापन करने वाले व्यक्ति 1993-94 में ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों में 22.18 प्रतिशत शहरी क्षेत्रों में 27.89 प्रतिशत और पूरे राज्य के लिए 24.21 प्रतिशत होने का अनुमान लगाया गया है। पूर्व अनुमान 1987-88 से संबंधित है, जिसमें गुजरात में गरीबी रेखा से नीचे जीवन-यापन करने वाले व्यक्तियों की संख्या ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों में 28.67 प्रतिशत, शहरी राज्यों में 37.26 प्रतिशत और पूरे राज्य के लिए 31.54 प्रतिशत होने का अनुमान लगाया गया है ।

(घ) और (ङ) गरीबी के अनुमान राज्य स्तर पर लगाए जाते हैं न कि जिला स्तर पर ।

Changes in the Gadgil-Mukherjee formula

2597. SHRI BHAGABAN MAJHI: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) the salient features of the Gadgil-Mukherjee formula adopted by the Planning Commission;

(b) whether several State Governments have demanded changes in the formula;

(c) if so, the reaction of Government thereto;

(d) whether Government propose to focus on prority sector; and

(e) if so, the steps taken In implementing the plan drawn-up in that regard?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION (SHRIMATI RATNAMALA DEHARESHWAR SAVANOOR): (a) Gadgil Mukherjee Formula as approved by National Development Council (NDC) in 1991 is the basis for allocating Normal Central Assistance to States Plan This formula was adopted for distribution of Normal Central Assistance during the Eighth Five Year Plan and Annual Plan 1997-98 As per this Formula, after setting apart funds required for Externally Aided Projects and

reasonable amounts of funds for Special Area Programmes, 30 percent of the balance U earmarked for 10 Special Category States. The balance amount is distributed among non-Special Category States on the baais of specific criteria and weights. The background note on Gadgil Mukherjee Formula is appended at Statement (See below).

(b) and (c) In the National Development Council (NDC) meeting held on M.1.97 as well as during the meetings between Deputy Chair -man and Chief Ministers at the time of finalisatior, of Annual Plan 1997-98, tome Chief Ministers have suggested further revision 'n the Formula. A revision in the Formula requires approval of NDC In order to enable the Planning Commission to take a hotis'ic view On the matter, all the Chief Ministers have been ie QWMHn[1] by the Planning Commisssion to Mad their considered views/comments on this issue The Commission is In the midst of receiving comments from the States On receipt of all these comments the metier would be put up to National Development Council for considers tioe.

(4) and *it)* Yea Sir The ap-peosrti paper to the Ninth Plan (t*H-»(tt) approved by the NDC in in meeting held on 1«-01-1997 (basset OB priority tfctoe The for-sjNtlaUoo of Ntnih Five Year Plan on the fcssas of approach pop* ts pre (tartly tsnderwsy ln Planning Coin-

STATEMENT

Planning Commission
(Financial Resources Division)

A Background Note on Gadgil Formula for distribution of Central Assistance to State Plans.

Prior to Fourth Five Year Plan, the allocation of Central Assistance to the State Plans was based on a schematic pattern and there was no definite formula for allocation. In view of the general demand for an objective and transparent formula for allocation of Central assistant* for State plans, a formula known ij Gadgil fomula was evolved ia 1969 which was adopted for distribution of plan asiSianct during the Fourth and Fifth Five Year plans. This formula was modi fied in 1980 and the modified formuli became the basis for allocation dur. iag the Sixth and Seventh Five Yjsj Plans- The modified formula wai again revised in 1990 and formed the basis for allocation of Central assistance for 1991-92 only. Following rep-esentations, the formula w>s further revised in 1991. The Gadgil Formula (1991). ha? been in operation during the Eighth Plan period. Only the details of 1991 formula art discussed below, as othe-s are only of historical value. However for comparisiOn purposes all the 4 for mulae with criterion and weight ta respect of distribute, rimong Non-Special Category States are g>veB at the end of the Statement.

Gadgil Formula (1991)

The formu'a is known as Gadgil-Mukherjee Formula. The man features of the formula are the following:

I. From the total Central assistance, set apart funds required for externally aided schemes.

II. From the balance, provide reasonable amounts for Special Area Programmes viz.

(a) Hill Areas;

(b) Tribal Areas;

(c) Border Areas;

(d) N.E.C.

(e) Other Programmes.

III. From the balance, give 30 per cent to the Special Category States.

IV. Distribute the balance among the non-Special Category States as per following criteria and weights.

Criteria	Weight (%)
1. Population (1971)	60
2. Per Capta Income	25
(a) 'Deviation' method-covering States with per capita SDP below the national average	20
(b) Distance method-covering all States	5
3. performance	7.5
(a) Tax effort	
(b) Fiscal Management and	
(c) Progress in respect of national objectives	
4. Special problems	7.5

Under the criterion of the progress in respect of national objectives, the approved formula covers four objectives viz; (i) population control and maiernai and child health; (ii) Uni-vwahsation of primary education and adult education; (iii) on time completion of extrnally aided projects; and (iv) success in land reforms. Weights have been assigned separately for each of these within the overall weight of 7 5 percent as under: —

Items	Weights
(a) Tax policy	2.5%
(b) Fiscal management	2.0%
(c) National Objective	3.0%
(i) Population control	1.0%
(ii) Elimination of illiteracy	1.0%
(iii) On-time completion of Externally aided projects	0.5%
(iv) Land reforms	0.5%

In respect of special problems there was no specine criteria and it was left to the planning commission to was its discretion in the allotment

Datila in regard to working out individual ther of states in regard to problems income critieria and perfernace are as under

Special category states

There is no ob jective cirtieria and weight for distribution among the special ca tegory states the main consideration were the level of allotment in the previsous yeard resource position o sttes and also development needs etd\c

Non special category states

1. Population riterion

60 percent weight is given to population. The population as P$^{er\ 1971}$ Census is taken into consideration. 1971 population has been adopted on the basis of a Statement of Policj issued in June 1977. Each of the 15 States is given Central assistance in proportion to 'he share of its population to total population.

2. Income criteria

25 percent weight has been assigned to this. This has two components namely 20 percent on the basis of Deviation criterion, and 5 percent on ance criterion.

(a) Deviation criterion—weight

The States are identified on 'he basis of per capita comparable State domestic Product compared t_0 the corresponding national overage. The Stares which are below national average a e identified and 20 percent of the assistance is exclu lotted v them l percent bend also permitted so that a State per capi'a SDP higher than the na one per- i the nai avenge is also give,) the benefit of being group of a below national average. Far the purpo*. of calcu' per capita SDP, an average of per capita for ihe latest thi for What* irftuals ar$_c$ available is taken into consideration The C S O had been entrusted with the ta*k of providing comparable per rapn$_a$ SDP of the States For I9M-«? the i wot year, *$_r$ 1860 91. ei-« end WW One, th« *auitt* are kJentsflfsj "net, rtlat onUe **baaia** of d; and substantial difference from nth States. These values were multi. plied with 1971 population of eacl .state. The product so derived d each State is divided by the total product and multiplied by the popu-lation.

(b) Distance Method Weight 5 per cent.

In tins case the comparable per capita State Domestic Product prepared by C.S.O. as in the case of Deviation Method is used. The distance of per capita income of each State from per capita income of that State which has the highest per capita income, i$_s$ measured. These values were multirjlied with the population of each state. The percentage share of each States is obtained by dividing 'he pmduct so arrived, at by the total products and multiplied by 100 Punjab and Goa have be->n 1996-97 ,i weight equal >o the weight of that State, which has the next height per capita income

An imp.i. l ,,$_i$i is that in ooth Deviation and Distance matin 1. the dig* mce from the highest per capitn income, to the per capit» income of each Stat w s to arrive at the share of ,-$_{a<}$ h State In the case of deviation method, deviation from the National ai uaad to identify the S eligible for allocation of assistance of 20 percent

Performance I

Tax KrTon

The basis of the criterign is the tex sdp ratio of a state the annual average tax recipts and compartable SDP of the stated for the latest 3 conservice years after computing years after computing the tax SDP ratio the share of each state is arrived at by connecerting the total of these pereenlages to 100 for 1996-97 data relating to 1990-93 were used

Fiscal Management

The criterion is based o$_n$ the diffe .,(,,e betvve.n Stales Own Resources icomprising of BCR, ARM, contribution *ot* pu^{olic} enterprises, small savings excluding UTl loans. Provi-cknt Funds, Miscellaneous Capital Eeceipts (Net), adjustment of opening/closing balance) as provided in the financing pattern approved for the State plan outlay-s and the actuals. A time period of 5 years (latest available) is taken into consideration. More precisely, the steps involved i$_n$ the calculation for determining the share of each State are:

it) the difference between the Stale's own resources as per the Annual Plan estimate and the actual is calculated as percentage of the Annua] Plan estimate of State's own resources, (ii) th$_e$ distance of each ='dt from the lowest performance is calculated and (hi) the share of each State is derived as percentage w the total distances. The lowes^l State is als$_0$ given a weight equival w to 'he State which ig nearest to Data relating to 1989-94 were «*j for determining th$_e$ share in converted into percentages to the total to determine the share of each State in the distribution. The methodology ol calculation is the same for birth rate and IMR. Since.both the considerations are given equal weight, the average of the two shares is calculated for each state and this determines its share in the total distribution, For the year 1996-97 dat$_a$ relating to 1993 and 1994 were used.

4. Elimination of Illiteracy

The indicator in this case is the performance relating to female literacy. We have chosen female literacy, as thi$_s$ focuses on an important segment of the population which needs special attention. The factors taken into consideration are the female literacy rate in 1991 and the decennial growth rate of female literacy-taken into consideration are the female literacy rate, the share of each State is determined as a proportion of each State's performance to the total of all States A similar method is followed with respect kv decennial growth rat$_e$> of female literacy. Since both th$_i$. considerations are given equal weight, an average of the two shares is calculated for each State and this determines its share in the total distribution For determining the share for 1996-97, the female literacy rate 1991 and Decennial growth 1981—1991 were used

5. On-Time Completion of External ly Aided Projects

This criterion takes into account available finance in the year for ex ternally aided projects as indicated by the Ministry of Finance in the Revised Estimates and the actual utilisation. I$_n$ this method, the ufi-i of externnl aid as a percent age of available finance for each State a, indicated in the Revised Est in year for which information i>> available filiated Thfc ratios arc converted as percentages '$_0$ the t***l which «ivc the share? of Individual

(ii) On-going major irrigation and projects

(iii) Per Capita Income of which

(a) According to the deviatio cov-ring only the States v income below the national

(b) According to the distar covering all the fifteen Sta

iv) Performance of which

(a) Tax effort

(b) Fiscal Management

(c) National Objectives

1 Population Control

2 Elimination of Female illit

States. For the year 1996-97 RE figures of Ministry of Finance for 1995 96 were used.

0. Land Reforms

The criterion for land reforms takes into account two indicators, namely area distributed as a percentage of surplus land declared by the State and area distributed by a State as a percentage of total ati distributed by all States. Bo- are assigned equal weight! The share of each State under eat indicator is Determined on the baa of each State's percentage 'o the toti. of all States. Since both the cons-, derations are given equal weight, «t' average of the two shares is calculated for each State and this determine! -Jts share in the total distribution. F« 1996-97 date of 1992 were used.

Criteria and weightage under Original Gadgil formula, Modified gadgil formula and formulas revised in October, 1990 and in December, 1991 for allocation of Central Assistance for State Plan

(Weightage %)

Criteria	Original Gadgil Formula (1969)	Modified Gadgil Formula (1980)	NDC Revised Formula (1990)	NDC Revised Formula (1991)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
A. Special Category States (10)	30 % share of 3 States excluding N.E.C.	30 % share of 8 States excluding N.E.C	30 % share of 10 States including N.E.C.	30 % share of 10 States excluding NEC
B. Non-Special Category States (15)				
(i) Population (1971)	60.0	60.0	55.00	60.0
(ii) On-going major irrigation and power projects	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
(iii) Per Capita Income of which	10.0	20.0	25.0	25.0
(a) According to the deviation method covering only the States with per capita income below the national average	10.0	20.0	20.0	20.0
(b) According to the distance method covering all the fifteen States	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0
iv) Performance of which	20.0	10.0	5.0	5.0
(a) Tax effort	10.0	10.0	0.0	2.5
(b) Fiscal Management	0.0	0.0	5.0	2.5
(c) National Objectives	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0
1 Population Control	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5
2 Elimination of Female illiteracy	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
3 On-time completion of externally aided projects	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5
4 Success in Land Reforms	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5
(v) Special Problems	10.0	10.0	15.0	7.5
TOTAL	10.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note Prior to Fourth Five Year Plan (1969-74) allocations varied from scheme to scheme. There was no formula as such for allocation of Central assistance for States' Plan. Thus, schematic pattern was in vogue.

मध्य प्रदेश में स्वीकृत परियोजनाएं

2598. **श्री गोविन्दराम मिरी** : क्या प्रधान मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) वर्ष 1995-96 के दौरान सरकार द्वारा कितनी परियोजनाएं स्वीकृत की गई तथा उनके लिए कितनी धनराशि स्वीकृत की गई ;

(ख) वर्ष 1996-97 तथा 1997-98 के दौरान मध्य प्रदेश की कौन-कौन सी परियोजनाओं को स्वीकृत करने हेतु केन्द्र सरकार द्वारा विचार किया गया है अथवा किया जा रहा है ;

(ग) क्या सरकार परियोजनाओं हेतु आवंटित भूमि का हस्तांतरण केन्द्रीय सरकार के नाम से करने संबंधी समस्या के निराकरण हेतु विचार कर रही है ;

(घ) क्या मध्य प्रदेश सरकार ने बान्धवगढ़ में ध्वनि एवं प्रकाश व्यवस्था हेतु 65 लाख रुपए का प्रस्ताव भेजा था ; और

(ङ) क्या सरकार उसे वर्ष 1997-98 में स्वीकृत करने का विचार रखती है ?

योजना और कार्यक्रम कार्यान्वयन मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्रीमती रमामाला देवीदार सक्सेना) : (क) और (ख) संसाधन की दृष्टि से योजना आयोग द्वारा मध्य प्रदेश के छिन्दवाड़ा जिले में "बांस के पौधे लगाने और पुनर्वास" पर एक परियोजना प्रस्ताव की 1995-96 में स्वीकृति दी गई थी इस परियोजना की लागत 23.913 मिलियन रु० थी और इसका वित्त पोषण इण्डो-कनाडियन एनवाइरनमेंट फैसिलटी द्वारा किया जाना था।

दिनांक 4-2-1997 को जल संसाधन मंत्रालय की तकनीकी सलाहकार समिति की सिफारिश के अंतर्गत अपर बेड़ा मझली सिंचाई परियोजना को योजना आयोग में प्राप्त किया गया था। राज्य सरकार द्वारा कुछ शर्तों का अनुपालन करने के बाद यह निदेश स्वीकृति के लिए इस परियोजना पर विचार करेगा।

(ग) जी नहीं।

(घ) और (ङ) पर्यटन विभाग ने 1997-98 के दौरान 66 लाख रुपए की केन्द्रीय वित्तीय सहायता के लिए ओरछा में सोनु इट लुमीरी (एसईएल) प्रदर्शन को प्राथमिकता के रूप में रखा गया है। इस परियोजना की स्वीकृति राज्य सरकार से मांगे निर्देशिकाओं के अनुरूप विस्तृत प्रस्ताव प्राप्त होने पर निर्भर करेगी।

Maharashtra Government's schemes for inclusion in the Ninth Five Year Plan

2599. MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Maharashtra Government has forwarded any projects